

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-20 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office action dated October 3, 2006, claim 2 was allowed, claims 1 and 4-20 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address Examiner's comments below. In addition, Applicants also thank Examiner for taking time to discuss proposed amendments to claims 1, 11 and 12 of the pending application with Applicants' representative in the Examiner Interview of November 28, 2006. As required by 37 CFR § 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04 and agreed upon with Examiner, the substance of the interview is incorporated in this amendment and response.

Applicants are adding new claims 21-26 with this Amendment and Response. These new claims are dependent claims that depend directly or indirectly from allowed claim 2. In addition, Applicants are amending claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, 17 and 20 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

As discussed with Examiner during the Examiner Interview, independent claims 1, 11 and 12 are now amended to include recitation of subject matter found allowable in independent claim 2. Claims 1, 11 and 12 now recite features corresponding to the features found allowable in independent claim 2. For example, claim 1 recited, *inter alia*, the following:

...

at least one of the application and system programs comprises a notification program configured to display a software enabled switch for enabling the radio unit from a disabled state in response to a program attempting to utilize the radio unit while leaving the processing unit in an operation state, and further configured to display information for a context associated with a state of the software enabled switch.

Thus, claims 1, 11 and 12 now include allowable subject matter. Likewise, as the independent claims are allowable, their respective dependent claims (claims 4-10 and 13-26) also should now be in condition for allowance.

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 2 and 4-26, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
CRAIG S. SKINNER, et al.

Dated: December 4, 2006

By: /Rajiv P. Patel/

Rajiv P. Patel, Reg. No. 39,327
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200